

**Illinois Commerce Commission**  
**SBC/Ameritech Illinois Merger, Docket 98-0555**  
**Performance Benchmarks Collaborative, Condition 30**  
**Draft Meeting Minutes From 9/19-20/2000**  
**To Be Reviewed and Approved 10/17/2000**

The ninth Illinois Performance Measure Collaborative was held on September 19 and 20, 2000, at the James R. Thompson Center (100 W. Randolph St., Chicago, IL), in conference room 8-032. Participants also attended the meetings via a conference bridge. Following are the minutes and action items from the meeting.

Mr. McClerren, ICC Staff, presided over the meeting.

September 19, 2000

I. Introductions

- A. Staff, Ameritech Illinois, CLECs, Other Parties
- B. Sign up sheet, with contact name, address, phone & e-mail address

II. Review and Approve Meeting Minutes From 8/16-17

The review and approval of the meeting minutes was postponed until 9/20 to allow time for parties to review SBC/Ameritech Illinois' proposed revisions to the draft minutes.

III. Status of SBC/Ameritech Waiver Request (FOC Issue)

Janeen Sanders of WCOM had offered a CLEC proposal to address the FOC issue, and Sal Fioretti of SBC/Ameritech Illinois had a counter proposal. Sal offered:

Method Handled	Percentage	CLEC Proposal	SBC/Am. Proposal
Electronic to Electronic	95%	1.5 Hours	2 Hours
Electronic to Manual	95%	5 Hours	8 Hours
Manual to Manual	95%	24 Hours	24 Hours

Sal indicated at the end of the first day that he needed to review the actual performance of SBC/Ameritech, and upon that review might be able to do better in his proposal.

The electronic to electronic metric was debated, and it was noted that the BA FOC interval was 2 hours, while the PacTel interval was for 20 minutes (an average number). The FOC discussion was tabled until the next day to give Sal the opportunity to review actual data.

At the start of the 20<sup>th</sup>, Sal reported that he had not yet received the information he was seeking. However, he had a new counter-offer as follows:

Method Handled	Percentage	New SBC/Ameritech Proposal
Electronic to Electronic	95%	2 Hours
Electronic to Manual	95%	5 Hours
Manual to Manual	95%	24 Hours

After a caucus period, the CLECs agreed to the proposal with two conditions: (1) the FOC proposal be effective in all five Ameritech states, (2) there be an understanding that the manual process will show improvement, per Sal's discussions with Rod Cox of McLeodUSA.

The FOC discussion concluded with a discussion of how Docket 00-0238 would be closed out. Tom Aridas indicated that the parties needed to contact the hearing examiner, but that there would need to be a status hearing, and all intervenors to the case would have to agree before the hearing examiner could close the docket.

#### IV. Gaining Access to Performance Measures

The number of firms signing an amendment to the interconnection agreement that would make the performance measurements and remedies applicable is increasing. In addition to Focal, AT&T has amended its interconnection agreement. It was also indicated that Rhythms may have amended its agreement, and other CLECs indicated amendments appeared imminent.

Mr. McClerren noted that tier 2 payments from SBC/Ameritech Illinois to the State of Illinois had commenced, with the first payment of \$705,500 paid on September 18 for the months of May, June, and July 2000.

#### V. Draft Matrix of Issues

The parties addressed the "\*\*\*" asterisk items from the teleconference on September 15. The CLECs characterized these items as the ones that might need to go to arbitration if not settled. Following is the performance measure number with discussion on status/positions:

17. Error Corrections in "X" Days - The issue has been resolved.
19. Daily Usage Feed Timeliness - The issue has been resolved.
27. New SWBT Model - Move to calendar days, not weekend for all internal measures, e.g., 27, 44, ... The issue has been resolved.
45. Parties were willing to wait for the 6 month review to address again.

55.2 Hot Cut process - The interval remains an issue. If implemented in Texas, may be able to implement here. Sal will send out a proposed business rule, with an upper limit of 50. The issue can be worked more in the Wisconsin hot cut process.

58. Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Disaggregating into fieldwork or no fieldwork is issue. Sal can do the request, would like to make a deal elsewhere.

64. Geography issue is settled - issue has been resolved.

70. Trunk Blocking Measure - To be discussed at 10:00 on 9/20.

122. Hot Cut Measures - Place holder - not a litigator now.

123. % Timely and Compliant - 13 state change management process not in place yet, will discuss later.

124. New, not a litigator now.

### September 20, 2000

The day started with the previously discussed FOC settlement discussion.

Then the meeting addressed the trunk group issue in Measure 70. Bill Werber of AT&T had some proposed language modifications, which were discussed at some length. However, terminology was still uncertain, and Karen Moore of AT&T volunteered to coordinate a discussion with SMEs. All interested parties are to contact her by 9/22. A proposal will go out to all parties by 10/10, so that it can be reviewed in more detail at the next collaborative on 10/17-18.

### VII. Remedy Plans

Mr. McClerren started the remedy plan discussion with the following scenario: "Imagine your boss told you that you had to implement the other side's remedy plan, but that you could make three changes in the remedy plan. What would those three changes be?" Many parties objected to the request, believing it would appear that with minor changes they would be willing to accept the other side's remedy plan. Mr. McClerren noted the dilemma, and indicated that the parties could caveat the three changes in whatever form they wished, and he understood it was a "meat cleaver" approach, but he still wanted to see the three issues.

Mike Kalb of AT&T then presented the CLECs most recent remedy plan. He noted there were some philosophical differences, such as a hard cap proposed by SBC/Ameritech Illinois and the threshold level proposed by the CLECs. Mr. Kalb noted that there were two types of statistical errors, type 1 and type 2, and that the CLECs

proposal balances the risk of the two error types. He noted that the SBC/Ameritech Illinois plan, with its K table, does not balance the risk.

The  $Z^*$  is calculated every month for every measure for every CLEC, not a fixed factor like SBC/Ameritech Illinois' critical Z.

Dan Levy of Arthur Andersen (representing SBC/Ameritech Illinois) questioned the delta J component mentioned on page 22, indicating that it is a judgment call based on engineering or some other input - not statistically based. Mr. Kalb agreed with this characterization, but did not believe it to be an onerous task. Mr. Kalb noted that this approach had already been embraced in Louisiana, Georgia, and Florida. While the delta J component has not been settled in these jurisdictions, the process is agreed on.

Mr. Kalb presented the tier 1 and tier 2 plans, noting they were similar except for the "market penetration factor" or "N", which is a sliding adjustment providing higher payments to the state when competition is low and lower payments when competition is higher. At 50% market penetration, N = zero, or no payment is made to the state. The computation of N does not account for facilities based carriers.

Remedy plans will be discussed further at the next meeting on October 17-18. At this point, it is the only issue that appears to be heading toward arbitration.

#### VIII. Next Meeting

For the next meeting, Mr. McClerren asked all parties to consider recommended characteristics for an arbitration. He also asked parties to consider the next meeting date, which would be a quarterly status meeting in either January or February, 2001.

Additionally, the hot cut issue (55.2, LNP with a Loop) proposal should go out so the parties can address further in Wisconsin.

By October 10, wording about #70, Trunk Group Measure should be distributed, as well as the "Parity with a Floor" proposal from CLECs. The top 3 issues about the remedy plans should also be distributed.

For the October 17-18 collaborative meeting, the parties were requested to indicate that the business rule document distributed by Sal Fioretti was accurate, or to indicate where the inaccuracies are at. Final review means that lack of identification of inaccuracies at the October 17-18 collaborative will indicate concurrence that the product is accurate.